

this way, internal equilibrium was preserved, and he could go on with his phantasy play undisturbed by terror of his own omnipotent success. Here is a point which will link up with the later study of *Guilt*.

(The element of *power* in these various forms of aggression is very clear. Sometimes the aggression is a direct response to interference/as when Paul says to Mrs. L, "I'll cut you up and eat you " because she will not let him go downstairs the moment he wishes. (Here we see that *eating* is not merely the surest form of ownership, but also the most effective means of getting rid of one's enemy!) Or when a grown-up does not immediately do what a child requests, as on several occasions with Harold. (Sometimes a child seizes an opportunity for power that happens to present itself, as when Benjie jumps on Mrs. I.'s back while she is kneeling. Or there may be a sudden assumption of the parental role, as when Frank says, " George *mustn't* scribble—well, he *can* if it's for smoke/" and so on. Duncan's annoyance when the other children said they could hear the rain, after he had pronounced that it *wasn't* raining (since *he* couldn't hear it) seems to be the typical parental attitude, of laying down, not merely the law, but the truth. And Dan was playing a pseudo-parental role in deciding when and how Jessica was to take her coat off.

(We cannot doubt that in most of these situations of power, the child is doing to others what he feels has so often been done to him—either in reality or in phantasy.) In Frank's playing the part of the fairy " on the roof ", we have a typical dream-situation of many adults, as well as a real position that all little children like to assume whenever opportunity offers—getting "• on top " of things, and being " bigger than you", in a position of supreme control. It is the phantasy of

projected on to some other person, and at another, the whole of the *super-ego*,

Pseudo-scientific behaviouristic descriptions, which attempt to leave out the dramatic element in human experience, usually leave out everything that has psychological significance at the same time, I have myself seen no statement of intrapsychical conflict in terms which expressly avoid these substantives which does not lose far more significant psychological truth than it gains. The psychical truth of *feeling* is expressed in such substantives. It does feel like that; and for the purpose of understanding the young child, these feelings seem to me far more significant than any pseudo-scientific ideology. Nevertheless, I would deprecate any tendency to multiply the number of such substantives, and I do not think any others are needed.

Q